



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,449	06/07/2000	Arda Akman	12096RNUS01U	9103

27820 7590 02/27/2003

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 1287
CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER

PARTON, KEVIN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

#7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/589,449

Applicant(s)

AKMAN, ARDA

Examiner

Kevin Parton

Art Unit

2153

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin Parton

(3) _____

(2) Taylor Davenport

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 26 February 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1,5 and 11

Identification of prior art discussed: Zhang et al. (USPN 6,381,646), Arrow et al. (USPN 6,154,839), Cave et al. (USPN 6,404,746)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The first topic of discussion was the nature of 103 rejections. Examiner Parton explained that the basis of this rejection is the well known network address translation of Zhang et al. (USPN 6,381,646) combined with the control protocol messages of Cave et al. (USPN 6,404,746). Mr. Davenport expressed that the motivation for this combination was not clear in the original rejection and that the forthcoming response would question the validity of the combination and the motivation. The thrust of the applicant's invention is the use of translation on control protocol messages specifically, while control protocol messages and network address translation are both common, the applicant argues that translation has not been done specifically on control protocol messages. No agreement was reached on this topic, but Examiner Parton will address the motivation with a primary examiner again before the next office action.

Regarding claim 5, Mr. Davenport argued that the specific portion of the reference cited does not teach a "port." The examiner conceded that a better figure or line of text could be cited, but that the use of the word port alone would not overcome the Zhang et al. (USPN 6,381,646) reference.

Finally, Regarding claim 11, Mr. Davenport argued that the claims clearly require that the claimed server is within the firewall. The examiner concedes that this argument would overcome the Arrow et al. (USPN 6,154,839) reference. The examiner requested that the limitation be more specifically stated in the claim because it was not originally interpreted that the server must be within the firewall.